

From: [Miller, Gary](#)
To: [Jacquelyn Young](#)
Cc: [Lisa Gossett](#); [Walters, Donn](#); sjones@galvbay.org; [Owens, Rock \(CAO\)](#); [O'Rourke, Terence \(CAO\)](#); [Allen, Bob \(PCS\)](#); [Satya Dwivedula](#); [Sanchez, Carlos](#); [Foster, Anne](#); [Leos, Valmichael](#)
Subject: RE: Flooding of San Jacinto River
Date: Thursday, May 21, 2015 11:09:59 AM
Attachments: [SJ River May 2015 real-time data plots.pdf](#)

Jackie,

Attached are the San Jacinto river flow conditions for 5/12 to 5/19 – flows were well below the 10-year storm.

On Thursday, 5/20/15, the PRPs checked the site and reported the following:

- Perimeter entrance gate and fence secure
- Overcast day for inspection; high flows in San Jacinto and during rising, flood tide
- Eastern cell is submerged
- Majority of western cell dry
- No visible cap damage in areas along water edge
- Significant vegetation growth noted

Below are some site pictures taken 5/20/15.

Regards,

Gary Miller

EPA Remedial Project Manager

214-665-8318

miller.garyg@epa.gov



9645621



May 20, 2015 at 9:31:39 AM



May 20, 2015 at 9:23:03 AM



From: Miller, Garyg

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 9:35 PM

To: 'Jacquelyn Young'

Cc: Lisa Gossett; Walters, Donn; sjones@galvbay.org; Owens, Rock (CAO); O'Rourke, Terence (CAO); Allen, Bob (PCS); Satya Dwivedula; Sanchez, Carlos; Foster, Anne

Subject: RE: Flooding of San Jacinto River

Jackie,

Thanks for the heads-up. The PRPs are arranging for a site visit/inspection tomorrow or within the next few days to check on the cap condition. I will also be getting the river flow conditions & will let you know so we can see how it compares to the design 100-year storm.

And yes, we are putting together a plan now to do some additional sampling. The cap pore-water sampling done in 2012 showed that the cap is isolating the river from the waste materials, but we only know that for 2012. While we believe that the conditions are unchanged, re-sampling will confirm whether that is still the case. New sampling of the river sediment pore-water beyond the cap and at the southern impoundment is also a part of the plan being put together now. We hope to use the EPA dive team to assist with placement/retrieval of the underwater samplers.

FYI, I'm attaching a section from the draft Remedial Investigation Report that discusses the cap pore-water sampling and results from 2012, also some figures & tables.

The northwest part of the cap is made of recycled concrete with a median rock size of 3-inches; about 20% finer material was also mixed with the recycled concrete to prevent the waste material from moving through the cap. The finer material was added there because it wasn't feasible to lay the geotextile (filter material) in that area due to depth & slope. The pore-water samplers in the northwest area (#s 001, 002, & 003) were all non-detect based on the 2012 sampling.

I don't believe that I have seen the oyster sample results from Burnett Bay you mentioned (south of the Lynchburg Reservoir?). The clams sampled for the Remedial Investigation were collected from around the northern waste pits and just south of I-10, or north of Lynchburg Reservoir. Any information you may have on oyster sample collection methods, timing, & results would be appreciated.

Regards,

Gary Miller

EPA Remedial Project Manager

214-665-8318

miller.garyg@epa.gov

From: Jacquelyn Young [<mailto:jeyoung@texanstogether.org>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 1:31 PM

To: Miller, Garyg

Cc: Lisa Gossett; Walters, Donn; sjones@galvbay.org; Owens, Rock (CAO); O'Rourke, Terence (CAO); Allen, Bob (PCS)

Subject: Flooding of San Jacinto River

Gary,

I have cc'd several other parties involved, as I welcome feedback on my concerns and the concerns of our community members

The recent flooding of the San Jacinto River, north of the Waste Pits, has broken historical records and has been covered on national news. For the past three days, community members living near the Pits have expressed concerns about the amount and velocity of water travelling down the River and over/around the Waste Pits. Greg Moss sent me an update yesterday- "the water is flowing very fast over it. The lower pits [eastern portion] are still under water but you can tell the current is flowing fast across them. I would think the northwest corner is getting eroded because that is where the main flow is hitting it. The lower pits you can see the current rolling over the top. Then you can see where the current changes from on top of the pits and the main river. It's rolling pretty well when it comes off the pits." and "Water is pretty high this morning. The wind is blowing from the south and with all the run off the west pit has quite a bit of water on it."

Greg's observation of the northwest corner of the Site is extremely concerning to me. It is my understanding that the northwest portion of the Site is *not* covered

by the geomembrane or crushed concrete and that the one time the monitoring well on the northwest portion was sampled, dioxin was found in the groundwater sample

Given my understandings, Greg's observations, and the lack of data, I don't feel confident that the cap is doing what it was intended by the EPA to do. The only data the EPA has relayed to us about the integrity of the cap is elevation data (which has shown slight variances) and pore sampling data (which has shown low levels of dioxin). Sure, maybe large volumes and high concentrations of wastes are not being released from the Site, but we're dealing with extremely toxic compounds in a residential area, north of an estuary that produces seafood for our Nation. *We need more data.* We need not to rely on theories when it comes to protecting public health and the environment, rather we need to rely on scientific data. Going back to my oyster concern that I expressed at the EPA's recent Open House - I see the contaminated oyster tissue sampled from Burnett Bay as an indicator that it is in a contaminated environment. Not knowing whether the contamination is residual or if it was released after the construction of the cap. It should be noted that Scott Jones follow-up on my oyster question with details about prohibited shellfish harvesting in that area.

I know that the Site is kind of in a holding pattern as the proposed remedy is decided. At the recent open house I was informed that there are discussions (I believe between Harris County, and the EPA) about the need for more sampling. I strongly feel that more sampling is imperative to uphold the EPA's mission "to protect human health and the environment." Prior to the Site's NPL listing and during the Superfund process, the surrounding communities, recreation, and fishing, are not in a holding pattern. I think that we can do better than what we are currently working with and I hope to receive a response that more sampling *will* take place.

Thank you,

Jackie Young